

62-1193

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

**SUBJECT: Senate Debate on the Confirmation of
John A. McCone as Director of
Central Intelligence**

1. In the attached book are the floor debates on your confirmation with a subject index and a page index of individual Senators' statements. Also, for ready reference, the book contains a synopsis of the statements made by each Senator. While the result of the voting was announced as 71 yeas and 12 nays, the true vote was 84 in favor and 15 against. The additions to the announced vote result from three pairs and from communications from absent Senators stating they would have voted yea if present. The three additional Senators voting nay in effect, through pairing, were Clark, Douglas and Morse.

2. A review of the Senate floor debate on 29, 30 and 31 January 1962 indicates two areas which have continuing significance for the Agency. These areas are: (a) the belief of many Senators that a Joint Committee on Intelligence or a Watchdog Committee is desirable based in part on allegations of lack of congressional supervision; and (b) the matter of committee jurisdiction over CIA, i. e., whether it is to be Foreign Relations or Armed Services.

3. Conflict of interest topics such as the [] the C-119 contract plus World War II profits and the California shipyards are important but were obvious smoke screens for other issues. Many Senators knew this and both Jackson and Russell addressed themselves to this point. There appears to be nothing which can or should be done with respect to these old matters. The question of lack of experience which was raised by a number of Senators should now be considered a dead issue.

([])

Reg. Counsel

4. The lack of congressional supervision issue masked in part an attack on the members of the two Senate Subcommittees and in part is also involved in the question of jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Russell has begun to respond to this issue by the recent full-scale joint meeting of the two CIA Subcommittees and it is to be hoped that he will hold periodic future meetings. An appropriate report by one or both of these Subcommittees would be extremely helpful. In the meantime, the Agency should be alert to take the initiative in advising the Subcommittees of developments and particularly those which will have or might have overt ramifications or carry risks of an impact which will become known publicly.

5. The question of Committee jurisdiction rests primarily, of course, with the Congress. Closer supervision by Armed Services and closer relationships as indicated above could have an ameliorating effect. There appears to be little the Agency can do directly on this question.

6. There are some subsidiary points which could receive some attention.

a. For internal consideration and possibly discussion with the Armed Services Committee would be a careful survey of the question raised by McCarthy, i.e., the juridical or legal basis for Agency covert operations. This is being worked on by the General Counsel's office.

b. In the case of Senator Douglas [redacted]

[redacted] it is believed it would be worthwhile to discuss this case with him. The purpose would be to illustrate the difficult position of the Agency in denying allegations. It would also illustrate how Washington gossip becomes legend simply by repetition. The true facts are basically very simple but turn the story exactly 180 degrees. It is not known that the Senator has interested himself particularly in Agency affairs in the past and a discussion with him on this specific point and the Agency in general could be well worthwhile.

STAT

c. When Senator Case was on the floor, he made the comment that he hoped Mr. McCone would read what he had to say and then proceeded to discuss the exemption from taxation of income from foreign-based corporations and ships. A reading both of his questions in the hearing and statements on the floor tends to indicate he was not very clear himself on some of the past issues he was discussing. It could well be that he started on these matters and was simply carried away with them without having the time to consider them in detail. It may be worthwhile to meet with him at a subsequent date and discuss the Agency generally, distinguishing between its intelligence activities and its covert operations and the difference in control and supervision between the two. It is noted that if Senator Russell does not place Margaret Chase Smith on the CIA Subcommittee, Francis Case would be next in line.

7. It is difficult to see that anything could be gained by attempting to push further into the "liberal" issue as being a basis for the opposition. While the issue is there it is doubtful there are any specific courses of action to alleviate it directly. Further, this would get us entwined in trying to distinguish between the liberal issue and those Senators who, in one way or another, are tied into the Drew Pearson situation. It is clear that if Drew Pearson espouses a cause and really makes an issue of it, he is going to have support from approximately ten Senators. Again, there is little that can be done directly on this.

8. In summary, we should continue to watch closely any developments on the Hill which might have a bearing on the Joint Committee or committee jurisdiction issue. The confirmation of the Deputy Director should shed some light on these matters. As indicated, I believe it would be worthwhile to see both Senator Douglas and Senator Case. We should, of course, continue to take the initiative with our two Senate Subcommittees and I will discuss further with Senator Russell the idea of a monthly meeting with the Armed Services Subcommittee.

JOHN S. WARNER
Legislative Counsel

Attachment

OGC/LC:JSW:mks (24 Feb 62)

Orig - DCI

1 - ER w/o att.

1 - Leg. C. Subject Confirmation File

Approved For Release 2002/09/04 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003100220019-6

1 - Leg. C. Chrono.